## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the present amendment and in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-7 are pending. In the present amendment, Claim 1 is currently amended. Support for the amendments to Claim 1 is provided, for example, in the specification at page 5, lines 2-5 and in Fig. 1. Thus, no new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 2, and 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over <u>Hamachi</u> (Japanese Publication No. 2004-189358) in view of <u>Yamanouchi</u> (Japanese Publication No. 2003-118967) and <u>Spitz et al.</u> (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0099288, hereinafter "<u>Spitz</u>").

In light of the outstanding grounds for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claimed invention, thereby to more clearly patentably define over the cited prior art. To that end, amended Claim 1 recites, inter alia, "a plurality of monitoring cameras separately installed at a plurality of monitoring points along at lease one escalator" and "said plurality of monitoring points include an entrance of an escalator, an exit of the escalator, or a location between said entrance and said exit." Claim 1 also recites that "said accumulated image data display device discriminates among said plurality of monitoring points installed at the escalator in response to the monitoring request which includes the escalator to be supervised and one piece of information regarding reproduction start date and time."

In light of the clarification provided to Claim 1, Claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinguishing over the cited prior art, next discussed.

Specifically, <u>Hamachi</u> discusses a conventional elevator monitoring device that displays an operation state and a video image of an elevator when an abnormality or operating condition malfunction occurs. A first monitor 7a displays the operation state of the

elevator while a second monitor 7b displays the corresponding video image. However, according to <u>Hamachi</u>, since there is only one camera installed in the elevator car, there is only one image displayed of each elevator on the supervisory monitor 7b. Generally, in shopping malls or the like in which there are elevators and escalators, there are a plurality of cameras installed at the escalator (i.e. at an entrance or exit of the escalator or a location therebetween). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that in the device of <u>Hamachi</u>, when a malfunction occurs in an elevator, it is impossible to immediately search for the cause and location of the malfunction because only <u>one image of each elevator</u> is displayed on the supervisory monitor 7b.

The Office Action cites paragraph [0050] of <u>Hamachi</u> which states that a display control means 107c "divides a screen into two or more fields, and displays two or more images in a basket simultaneously." However, the display of two or more images simultaneously in <u>Hamachi</u> corresponds to two or more elevators, not two or more points along an escalator, as recited in Claim 1. Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that <u>Spitz</u> and <u>Yamanouchi</u> do not cure the deficiencies of <u>Hamachi</u>. Specifically, <u>Yamanouchi</u> in Fig. 6 (asserted in the Office Action as disclosing the claimed plurality of monitoring points) merely describes <u>one</u> monitoring point along each of an escalator and a moving walkway. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 1, and all claims dependent thereon, be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

Customer Number 22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 08/09) Eckhard H. Kuesters Attorney of Record Registration No. 28,870

Adnan H. Bohri Registration No. 62,648